

Cancel Claims 1, 3, 5, ~~7~~⁸ - 9, 12 and 13 without prejudice.

REMARKS

New Claims 16 and 17 have been added, while Claim 2, 4, 6,
5 7, 10 and 11 has been amended and Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 12 and 13
have been cancelled.

In compliance with the Requirement For Restriction, Appli-
cant affirms the election of Group I, containing Claims 1 - 9, 12
10 and 13, but respectfully traverses said requirement on grounds
that the present application properly relates to a single
invention, namely, a method and products made by that method.
Therefore, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw
the requirement and to act upon all of the claims.

15 Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9 have been rejected as being
anticipated by Ribí. However, Claim 1 has been replaced by new
Claim 16 which requires that any supporting layer for the
thermochromic film be peeled off. This step is not suggested in
20 Ribí. However, as stated in Applicant's specification, page 5,
lines 5 - 26, this is a major feature of Applicant's method and
the products produced by that method. Therefore, new Claim 16 is
believed to clearly and patentably distinguish over Ribí and the
Examiner is requested to allow Claim 16. Claims 4 and 6 are
25 dependent from new Claim 16 and, hence, include all of the

limitations of the parent Claim 16. Therefore. Claims 4 and 6 are each believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to parent Claim 16 and the Examiner is requested to allow each of Claims 4 and 6.

5

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 13 have been rejected as being anticipated by Shibahashi. However, Claims 1 and 12 have been replaced by new Claim 16 which requires that any supporting layer for the thermochromic film be peeled off. This step is not suggested in Shibahashi. However, as stated in Applicant's specification, page 5, lines 5 - 26, this is a major feature of Applicant's method and the products produced by that method. Therefore, new Claim 16 is believed to clearly and patentably distinguish over Shibahashi and the Examiner is requested to allow Claim 16. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are dependent from new Claim 16 and, hence, include all of the limitations of the parent Claim 16. Therefore. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are each believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to parent Claim 16 and the Examiner is requested to allow each of Claims 2, 4 and 6.

20

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 12 and 13 have been rejected as being anticipated by Nakasuji et al. However, Claims 1 and 12 have been replaced by new Claim 16 which requires that any supporting layer for the thermochromic film be peeled off. This step is not

25

suggested in Nakasuji. However, as stated in Applicant's specification, page 5, lines 5 - 26, this is a major feature of Applicant's method and the products produced by that method. Therefore, new Claim 16 is believed to clearly and patentably distinguish over Nakasuji and the Examiner is requested to allow Claim 16. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are dependent from new Claim 16 and, hence, include all of the limitations of the parent Claim 16. Therefore. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are each believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to parent Claim 16 and the Examiner is requested to allow each of Claims 2, 4 and 6.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8 and 9 have been rejected as being anticipated by Kito et al. However, Claim 1 has been replaced by new Claim 16 which requires that any supporting layer for the thermochromic film be peeled off. This step is not suggested in Kito. However, as stated in Applicant's specification, page 5, lines 5 - 26, this is a major feature of Applicant's method and the products produced by that method. Therefore, new Claim 16 is believed to clearly and patentably distinguish over Kito and the Examiner is requested to allow Claim 16. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are dependent from new Claim 16 and, hence, include all of the limitations of the parent Claim 16. Therefore. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are each believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to parent Claim 16 and the Examiner is requested to allow each of Claims 2, 4 and 6.

Claims 1, 4 and 8 have been rejected as being anticipated by Chemical Abstracts93:159126. However, Claim 1 has been replaced by new Claim 16 which requires that any supporting layer for the thermochromic film be peeled off. This step is not suggested in Kito. However, as stated in Applicant's specification, page 5, lines 5 - 26, this is a major feature of Applicant's method and the products produced by that method. Therefore, new Claim 16 is believed to clearly and patentably distinguish over the Chemical Abstract and the Examiner is requested to allow Claim 16. Claim 4 is dependent from new Claim 16 and, hence, include all of the limitations of the parent Claim 16. Therefore. Claim 4 is believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to parent Claim 16 and the Examiner is requested to allow each of Claim 4.

Claim 7 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Ribí in view of Shibahashi. However, reconsideration is requested of this rejection. As now presented, Claim 7 is dependent from new Claim 16 which requires that any supporting layer for the thermochromic film be peeled off. This step is not suggested in either Ribí or Shibahashi. However, as stated in Applicant's specification, page 5, lines 5 - 26, this is a major feature of Applicant's method and the products produced by that method. Therefore, new Claim 16 is believed to clearly and patentably distinguish over either Ribí or Shibahashi and the Examiner is requested to allow Claim

7.

For the foregoing reasons, each of Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11
and 16 are believed to be patentable and the Examiner is re-
5 requested to allow each of these claims and to pass the case to
issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert M. Sperry

Robert M. Sperry, Esq.

Attorney For Applicant

23390 Ostronic Drive

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Phone and Fax: (818) 225-1011